The Modern Churchman.

No. 12. MARCH, 1918. Vol. VII.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

A Promising Compromise.

Liberal Churchmen will feel thankful that the Church Missionary Society, at its meeting on February 12th, reached an agreement by which it is saved from disruption. The Sub-Committee appointed to deal with the difficult situation did its work with admirable dispatch and ability, and its unanimous report was adopted by the General Committee of the Society.

The phraseology and outlook of the report is naturally marked by the school whence it proceeds, but its substance exhibits the influence of modern thought and feeling. Where the report deals with ritual questions it permits a larger liberty; where it deals with relations to other Missionary Societies, it advocates brotherly feeling and co-operation, providing there be no sacrifice of Evangelical principles; where it deals with Missionary candidates and their attitude towards Holy Scripture, it practically concedes everything which a reasonable Liberalism desires. Very wisely it declines to formulate any definite mode of Biblical inspiration, but requires a belief that Holy Scripture, as a whole, is inspired. We think this is the right belief to demand. It is not a belief in the Divine Inspiration of some particular word, or verse, or passage, which is desired, but a belief in the Divine Inspiration of Scripture as a whole—an inspiration which is clearly observable when we regard the unity of purpose, the continuity of fundamental faith, the wonderful religious and moral development which run through the Bible, and which the

higher literary and historical criticism has done so much bring into clearer light.

Besides the needful belief in the Inspiration of Scripture, th report affirms that no knowledge of Scripture is adequa which does not lead to the knowledge of Jesus Christ, an declares that a right use and treatment of the Bible should b in harmony with our Lord's use and treatment of it. This an admirable ideal to set before Biblical students. Too fe realise what that ideal is or what it involves, but the Christia Church has everything to hope from a ministry which w make this their ideal of Bible study.

A third point to be noted in connection with this subject the declaration of the report that:—

> "It is the duty of the student of Holy Scripture, under the guidan of the Holy Spirit, to employ every faculty in its study, and to take in the fullest consideration every light that scholarship and saintliness ca furnish."

In laying down regulations in connection with the acceptanc of candidates, the report suggests:—

> "That personal devotion to Christ as Lord and Saviour, should be a primary condition for acceptance, and that such doctrinal definitio as are appropriate to maturer years should not be required."

That also is most happily expressed. What we desire i our young men is personal devotion to Christ; our old men ma be dogmatists if they will. Yet it was a very old man wh said: "Little children love one another," and when he wa rebuked said: "If only they love, it is enough."

The report, we observe, does not favour amalgamation wit any other Missionary Society. We believe this to be a soun policy. Amalgamation and centralisation, and all the device of bureaucracy and commerce, are not necessarily a help i spiritual and educational undertakings. Uniformity and red tape and vast head-offices are things to be avoided if possibl They have nothing at all to do with fellowship and unit of spirit. Personal freedom, local enterprise, many-side endeavour, are what the Church needs, and these things a

apt to be killed by the bureaucratic machine. The soul is refreshed not by the mighty but turgid tide of the Euphrates, but by the waters of Shiloah that go softly.

A Romanist Manifesto.

Cardinal Bourne's *Message to the Nation*[1] which is being circulated through the length and breadth of England, deserves the attention of English Churchmen. It deals ostensibly with the part to be played by the Roman Catholic Church in the work of social reconstruction in England. In reality it is a thinly disguised attack upon the English Reformation. Its description of the present social unrest is familiar, and is probably accurate. When, however, it claims to find the *fons et origo* of our evil social conditions in the Reformation, we feel bound to protest in the interests of truth and freedom.

Under the heading, "Some Fruits of the Reformation," the Cardinal writes:—

> "It is well for us to re-call that the present social dislocation has arisen precisely because the teaching of the Catholic Church had been forgotten. In the sixteenth century England broke away from the religious unity of Europe. The popular faith was violently ousted, and the spiritual authority of the Pope rejected."

What was "the religious unity of Europe" before the sixteenth century? It had already been broken by the Great Schism between the Orthodox and Latin Churches. Moreover it had been repeatedly disfigured by the conflicts of popes and anti-popes. In the West the unity of the Latin Church was only maintained by bitter persecution as in the case of the terrible slaughter of the Albigenses in the early 13th century. The notion that social conditions were satisfactory and harmonious when Romanism was supreme in pre-Reformation times is absurd. We have only to recall the iniquitous Statutes of Labourers of 1351-53, or the Peasant's Revolt of 1381, or Longland's *Complaint of Piers the Ploughman*, of

[1] It appeared under this heading in a four column advertisement in the *Times*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Yorkshire Post*, *&c.*, on March 4th, 1918.

1380, one of the bitterest satires on English social conditions ever written, to realise that social injustice in England some hundred and fifty years before the Reformation was at least as great as at any period after it. Moreover it is equally clear that the social reformers of that day did not look to the Pope or his legates, or to the Archbishops and Bishops, as the heralds and protagonists of better social conditions, indeed just the reverse:[2] they did look in certain cases to Christ and His Gospel, but that is not quite the same thing.

When Cardinal Bourne tells us that

> "Capitalism began really with the robbery of Church property in the sixteenth century, which threw the economic and social advantages into the hands of the land-owning and trading classes,"

he might, with as much truth, trace capitalism back to the suppression of the Knights Templars a couple of centuries earlier by a servile Papacy. When has capitalism not existed in any civilized state, and when have economic and social advantages not been with the land-owning and trading classes? It is a pity that a document which ostensibly seeks to shew that the teaching of Christ is the friend of social justice, and that the social conditions which have prevailed in England but are now rapidly passing away in the furnace of the War are fundamentally un-Christian, should be disfigured by such a gross exhibition of the *odium theologicum*. Let the Cardinal remember the social condition of the Papal States, and examine whether the social condition of Papal Spain to-day is as satisfactory as that of Protestant England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland and Prussia, before he ventures to attribute evil social conditions to the Reformation, and to suggest that good social conditions are allied to and find their strength and safety in Romanism.

When Cardinal Bourne undertakes to address the English nation and to tell Englishmen that Romanism is their true friend and Protestantism their evil companion, he is playing

[2] If we recollect rightly Wat Tyler's revolting peasants beheaded Simon de Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, and presumably the English Papal Legate of that period.

a dangerous game, for although the masses of our countrymen read little history, yet they do read their newspapers. They all believe that the cause of social reform is the cause of justice, freedom, mercy and humanity, yet what succouring part has the Papacy played in that humane and righteous, free and merciful cause for which the British Empire has been making such tremendous sacrifices during the last three and a half years? Whilst we gladly maintain that many Roman Catholics are loyal citizens of the British Empire, yet it is a painful fact that large sections of the Roman Catholic communion, whether in Ireland, Canada, or Australia, have been a source of anxiety and difficulty to their loyalist neighbours during this terrible time. Moreover, during this tremendous crisis the authorities of the Roman Church have failed to give that assistance to the British Empire which would have rendered all patriotic Englishmen deeply grateful to the Papacy. Instead, the Papacy has chosen to play its own game. If that game can be won by posing as the friend of International Socialism or of German Imperialism, we have no doubt these *rôles* will be adopted, but we also know from the past history of the Papacy, that its supreme object is neither social welfare nor national freedom, but the fixing of the triple crown more firmly on the brow of the Roman Pontiff. As for emperors and kings, capitalists and plutocrats, it has no objection to their being abased, providing its own absolute and exclusive authority can be secured thereby. It has no objection to freeing men's bodies providing it can continue to fetter their minds and consciences.

Yet, on the other hand, it ought to be recognised that the Papacy, true to its imperial tradition and love of discipline and order, has always been the enemy of anarchy and the steady friend of social order. It is this fact which has led many, and not least the Kaiser, who have no love for Roman piety or Roman Papal claims, to turn towards the Papacy not as the Rock of Peter, but as the Rock of Ages, when society seemed

to be threatened with destruction by the wild forces Syndicalism and Anarchy.

Lay Dissatisfaction with Episcopal Action.

The absorbing duties of the war are claiming the ener and interest of all patriotic Englishmen, yet there are sig that the efforts of the Romanizing party in the English Chur to use the war for their own purposes is causing unrest in t minds of the laity.

The Bishop of Chichester's recent decision in favour of t use of wafer bread has given offence to many Prayer-Bo Churchmen in his diocese.

We notice, too, that the *Salisbury Times*, of March 1, de in a long leading article with the Bishop of Salisbur dedication of calvaries, and his defence of the crucifix against the "empty cross." The leader-writer believes th the majority of Englishmen object to the erection of calvar in public places, and urges that instead of raising our hats, the Bishop suggested, when we pass a calvary, we should do whenever we pass a disabled or wounded soldier—for he "the living personification of the spirit of the life that preced Calvary." The writer maintains that our money should spent on the sufferers from the War, rather than in erecti expensive, and in some cases distasteful, war memorials.

The *Somerset County Gazette* of March 2nd, contains a lo account of the prohibition by the Bishop of Taunton of t Rev. James Boyle, Vicar of Wembdon, who, with the cons of the churchwardens, had invited the Rev. W. E. Cloutm a Congregational minister, to preach in the parish church o Thursday evening in Lent. The Vicar obeyed the episco prohibition, but delivered to a crowded congregation, on t Sunday evening following, a sermon in which he declared t his invitation was no expression of preference for Cong gationalism, but

"a willingness to recognise as a minister of God's grace one whom the Holy Spirit recognizes, a token of essential unity, an attempt to put into practice what multitudes are talking about."

We confess that the episcopal action seems to us to be xceedingly injudicious in these three cases. To break the aw or connive at breaking the law where it pleases one's redilections, but to insist most strictly on its observance hen one has a *penchant* for that particular regulation is to ring the law and the authorities that administer it into lisrespect, and we fear that that is what these bishops are oing. We do not suppose that most Liberal Churchmen ave the slightest objection on doctrinal grounds to wafers or rucifixes, but they have the strongest objection to forcing hem on protesting laymen, especially at the present time. In he case of "interchange of pulpits," it is needful, as we have rged before, since the Bishops are for the most part resolved ot to allow any breach of the present law, to get the law mended.

It is high time that the Churchmen's Union approached the cclesiastical authorities by means of a memorial as a preiminary to further action.

We observe that the Bishop of London has just forbidden he Rev. Conrad Noel to preach at the City Temple on a Thursday morning in Lent.

An Educational Experiment in the Army.

The Rev. R. E. Kirk, S.C.F., formerly Tutor of Keble College, Oxford, gives an interesting account in the *Chaplain's Bulletin* of educational experiments with the troops in the eld.

The work consisted of reading together some selected book, .g., *The Student in Arms,* Rowntree's *Poverty*, or some of Ruskin's writings.

The method was as follows:—The book was read by the nofficial teacher, its main principles outlined by him and

discussed; then various chapters were taken in detail. At a times the book was passed round among the men, and son of them read a good deal of it. In many cases the expe ments got little beyond the stage of beginnings, but enou was done to shew that the system was capable of developmen

Certain conclusions at which Mr. Kirk arrived are of gre importance in their bearing both upon our national system education and the recent extension of the franchise. Mr. Ki writes:—

"(1) A vast majority of our troops—representing the entire body unskilled labour before the war and a great part of the *irresponsi* skilled workmen (thus excluding foremen, managers, clerks, and othe in responsible positions)—do not think at all. They have vague ide about things and many flashes of real insight; but they have no pow either of summarising and appraising evidence, of expressing their ow ideas coherently and logically. Until this is altered, progress in eve direction—religious, political, social—is bound to be inhibited.

"(2) To alter it you must teach them, briefly, to read and to wri *Reading*, in its full sense, includes the selection of subjects and of su books as bear upon them; the power of summarising their contents general, and then of assimilating them in detail; finally, the sifting the contents into true and false, relevant and irrelevant, with the accep ance of the good and rejection of the bad. *Writing* includes t expression of ideas obtained by reading, observation, and reflectio developed, illustrated, and set forth with a view to the particul mentality of those who are to read. Reading in this sense is t handmaid of thought, writing of speech.

"(3) We adopted this as a principle, that we would aim at no mo than teaching reading and writing. As to *what* was read or written, mattered little; the selection was made in accordance with the wish or temperament of the men who took part in the courses. In oth words, we held that in education of this kind it was method rather th matter that had to be instilled.

"(4) As a further principle we decided that we must work with grou rather than with individuals, thus following the example of the Stu Circle System and the Workers' Educational Association. In dealin with men of the type I have indicated this appears to be all-importa for their minds act with far greater alertness in company than alone. fact, it may be true to say that few of them have reached the stage individual thought as yet: they still think and argue as group-minds.'

The writer of this article, no doubt like many other clerg men, has tried the experiment of a Men's Social Reading Clu meeting in his study on winter evenings. After tryin

biographies and books of travel, he has found the *pièce de résistance* to be J. R. Green's *Short History of the English People*.[1] Every member was required to own and read his own book. It takes two or three winters to read through, but forms one of the finest means of education imaginable in the principles and development of English civilisation. It was Carlyle who said: The history of a nation is its own Bible. The leader of the club should take particular pains to illustrate Green from local examples, it may be of place-names, buildings, customs, institutions, &c. By doing so he adds much to the interest and reality of the proceedings.

OUR CHIEF NEED.

An Address to a meeting of Ministers.

By the Rev. F. J. Powicke, D.D.

We are truly said to be living in a difficult time. Some tell us it is the last time; and that the end of all things is at hand. I cannot in the least agree with them. I am much more inclined to think that we are nearer the beginning of the Christian era than the end; and that we are moving on to a glorious age. But still it is true that the war has brought about a great shaking and searching of hearts. We ministers, and our churches, in particular, have been forced to face some unpleasant facts. The fact, *e.g.*, that we have had very little influence on the course of events; the fact that we have lost our hold, to a great extent, on the streams of tendency and the streams of people outside; the fact that, on the whole, congregations have become smaller instead of larger since the war began; and so the fact that not a few of us are agitated by anxieties and alarms in view of the future. What is the root

[1] 2 vols., Dent, 1/3 each, Everyman's Library.

of our trouble? Perhaps it has more roots than one. But what is the chief? Some weeks ago I was present at a conference of ministers called on purpose to consider that question; and, after two or three hours of quiet talk and prayer, the conclusion reached was this:—that we have been too "distracted," we have been trying to serve more than one Master, we have been wanting in simple loyalty to Christ. Here, it was agreed, is the chief root of our trouble; and, if so, the remedy is clear—we must make our surrender more complete. Was it a right conclusion? For myself, I have no doubt at all that it was.

There is no lack of formal devotion to Christ. We say "Lord, Lord," often enough. The name "Lord," or "our Lord," or "our adorable Lord," or "our Lord Jesus Christ" occurs in most of our hymns or prayers, or sermons, or even our common talk. There are those who seem almost to avoid the name of "Jesus" only—although it is the favourite name in the fourth Gospel. It is not, they seem to fancy, sufficiently reverential. But mere use of the name Lord, however reverent, is nothing. The question is how far we appreciate the true force of the name as applied to Jesus. Does it mean for us, let us ask, what it meant for the first disciples?

Dr. Benjamin Bacon, the eminent American New Testament scholar, says:—

> "What made all Christians one from the beginning, and infused them with the tremendous dynamic which made conquest of the world possible, was the faith that Jesus is Lord;" and, again, "The title which the Church disputed in bloody conflict with Roman Emperors, with heathen demi-gods and divinities, and with Jewish angels and archangels, was 'the Lordship' of Jesus."

A glance at the New Testament, apart from the Gospels, may show us that he is right. When Paul, *e.g.*, wrote to the Corinthians, among whom were some gainsayers who charged him with making too much of himself, he said—"We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus as Lord and ourselves as your servants for Jesus sake." And what the Lordship of Jesus meant to Paul appears from his statement in the Philippians

that, because Jesus, "being found in fashion as a man, humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto Death, yea, the Death of the Cross," therefore, "God highly exalted Him and gave unto Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

To the same effect he speaks, in his Ephesian letter, of "the strength of God's might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come; and He put all things in subjection under His feet." In other words, the Resurrection revealed Jesus; crowned Him with glory and honour; justified, and more, the highest thoughts of Him, which had occurred to His disciples during the days of their earthly intercourse—thoughts which had been eclipsed by His death.

Read Peter's address on the day of Pentecost—an address based on three quotations from the Old Testament—and you find that the climax to which it leads up is just this:—"So let the house of Israel understand without a doubt that God has made Him both Lord and Christ, this very Jesus whom you have crucified." Indeed the simple confession—Jesus is Lord—became the central fact of Christian faith, drawing after it the utmost devotion of heart and mind. "If thou confessest with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord, and believest in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead thou shalt be saved." Nothing more was required because everything else was involved.

Nor did such loyalty to Christ evoke any sense of incongruity with absolute loyalty to God. For experience, at any rate, God and Christ were one. God was in Christ; Christ had the value of God; had so unveiled Him as to leave no desires unsatisfied. God who said "Light shall shine out of darkness,

hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ." That was enough. Neither Paul nor even the fourth Evangelist, so far as one can see, worked out any metaphysical theory of the relation between God and Jesus. Neither one nor the other would have passed muster as orthodox Trinitarians.

Orthodoxy, in the conventional sense, is not to be found in the New Testament; it is buried in the creeds. But Paul, and John, and Peter, and the rest knew, with every faculty of their soul, that in Jesus, God—"the real God and eternal life"—had come to them, had quickened and enlightened and redeemed them; and that, in serving Him with their whole being they were indeed serving God. Thus, the practical way of life became, as regards its general direction, perfectly clear to them. In all that related to matters of conduct and faith, what they had to do was just to ascertain the mind of Christ, and act accordingly. The mind of Christ, determined by His remembered words and deeds, and interpreted by the light of His indwelling spirit, was the supreme test. Every other standard was secondary. What their own uninstructed conscience might say was secondary. What Moses and the Prophets might say was secondary. What the Rabbis might say was secondary. What great teachers like Plato might say was secondary. Still more, what current opinion, or the decrees of an emperor might say, was secondary. Nothing carried authority save so far as it agreed with the known mind of Christ. This, to the Christian, was his one sure guiding light. And he discovered that, in obeying the mind of Christ, Christ proved Himself a power as well as a guide—an inward power of courage, and patience, and enthusiasm, which lifted Him above His natural weaknesses, and enabled Him to meet all difficulties and sufferings in the spirit of "more than a conqueror." As Paul said:—"I can do all things through Christ that strengthens me. As John said:—"This the victory that overcometh the world, even your faith."

Well, it is not for me to pass a sweeping judgment, or to say exactly how far our own attitude towards Christ has deviated from that of those first Christians. But I think I am not going too far, if I say that it is not so simple as theirs. I mean that it is more complicated by an undue attachment to other masters. I think we bow more than enough before traditions, and creeds, and great names of the past, and established institutions, and the spirit of denominationalism, and sectarian opinion, and our own private judgment.

Perhaps, too, we bow more than enough before the Bible as a whole; before Moses and the prophets—unheedful of the voice which said of Jesus from the "excellent glory":—"This is My beloved Son, hear ye Him."

That voice is sounding still; and calls us back to our allegiance. Moreover, if we have come to fancy that the Jesus we are to hear is one of whom the vision "fades in ancient shades," it calls us to realize afresh that He is also a living spirit soliciting the subjection to Him of the very "thoughts and intents" of our hearts, and as ready now as at the first to lead us into the light of His truth.

Our need then—our greatest need—is to regain the "simplicity which is toward Christ;" and the effect of this would be transforming in many ways. Let me mention two or three.

(*a*) It might clear and rectify our view as to the Church and its function. Jesus said to the Pharisees, the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; and we can think of Him as saying any time during the last 1,600 years, the Church was made for man, not man for the Church.

Jesus does not seem to have referred to the Church more than twice (Matt. xvi. 18, Matt. xviii. 17). Indeed, there is some reason to think that He did not mention it at all, or do anything more than lay the foundation of a Church, before His death. His chief concern, His absorbing business, was with the Realm or Rule of God on earth. And, when the Church arose on the Day of Pentecost, it came into existence as just

a realized bit of the kingdom; and as a means to its furtherance. We miss the point entirely if we note the fact that references to the Church abound in the Acts and Epistles, while the kingdom is barely mentioned; and then infer that the kingdom has been *replaced* by the Church. No, the kingdom is *served* by the Church as it had been by its Founder.

The Church or Churches are a multiplied incarnation of the Master's spirit, enabling Him to do from many local centres the self-same work which He began to do in Galilee. They are His living instrument for the kingdom; and surely the last thought in His mind was that the Church should become a self-regarding and self-glorifying institution, or an institution handed over to officials claiming power and right to open or shut the doors of heaven, or an institution fascinated and fettered by its own symbols and sacraments, or an institution pretending to be the one fold, outside of which there is no real truth, no genuine goodness, no assured salvation. Such a Church is a form of anti-Christ. It is a new edition of the Jewish Church at its worst, and is destined to a like doom.

The Church's most fatal mistake has been to forget that it is nothing but a means. Its ministry and its worship have for their proper end an edifying, or building up, of its members in those powers of the spirit whereby they become efficient agents of the kingdom. Not otherwise can it carry on the ministry of its Lord. Not otherwise can it follow Him in His passion of service. Not otherwise can it save its life by losing it in saving the world.

If, then, the question were asked, what is the worth of any particular Church, the answer would be, just its worth for the kingdom. Or, if the question were asked, what is our own worth as ministers of the Church, the answer would be, our worth may be measured by the degree in which we are striving to animate it by an enlightened enthusiasm for the kingdom and its righteousness. Or, if the question were asked, what is our right attitude towards Churches other than our own, the

answer would be, our right attitude is to look away from what may seem to us their errors of doctrine, or their faults of organization, or their deficiencies of practice; it is to cherish esteem for them so far as they are manifestly working the work of Christ; it is to rejoice if they are, in any way, doing that work better than our own, and not even to dream of gaining an advantage at their expense. Or, if the question were asked, how shall we behave in respect of good men and movements outside *all* the Churches, the answer would be, give them God speed, hail them as comrades, do your best to learn from them —assured of this, that no man or movement that is trying to cast out the devils of sin, and pain, and disease, can possibly come under the condemnation of Christ.

(*b*) And so I am led to make a second remark—namely—that simple loyalty to Christ must constrain us to lay emphasis on the fact that Christianity is much more a life than a creed. And who can question the statement that the essential principle of its life is the spirit of holy, unselfish, courageous love?

Jesus had it for His all-inclusive purpose to reveal the Fatherly love of God—its inconceivable pureness and richness and universality. His own life was the embodiment of its meaning. All His ethical precepts were but expressions and applications of it under various aspects. His final commandment called attention to it as the summary of His will. His own prayer for the Church was that it might realize the unity which love creates. What seems to have been the last prayer that passed His lips was love's compassionate cry for mercy on those who, in maltreating Him, knew not what they did. And the Cross was the symbol of love's uttermost sacrifice for the salvation of the world; love's supreme act of faith in its own omnipotence. No one understood this better than St. Paul. Not faith by itself; but faith working by love was the mainspring of his Gospel. Our only debt to one another—a debt created by God's love in Christ to us—is a love which works no ill to (or never wrongs) a neighbour; and so fulfils the law

(Romans xiii. 8-10). Never wrongs a neighbour? Nay, abounds in good to them.

Let me read you (in Dr. Moffatt's beautiful rendering) the Apostle's Psalm of Love:—

> "Love is very patient, very kind.
> Love knows no jealousy.
> Love makes no parade, gives itself no airs, is never rude, never selfish, never irritated, never resentful.
> Love is never glad when others go wrong.
> Love is gladdened by goodness, always slow to expose evil, always eager to believe the best, always hopeful, always patient."

Here, if anywhere, is the mind of Christ. Here, if anywhere, He points the way to that truth of life in which all His followers must share; and which alone can dissolve, not indeed all differences of opinion, but the animosities so apt to spring from them. Here, if anywhere, is the secret of that "beauty of holiness" by which the Church has never failed to capture the hearts of men who turn away, derisively or sadly, from a loveless creed.

(*c*) My last remark is this: Jesus is really the Lord, whether He is practically acknowledged or not. He really reigns. Nothing can dislodge Him from the place which is His by right. He is no longer, if He ever was, the blood-drenched sufferer, the passive victim of non-resistance depicted by men of imperfect insight like Mr. H. G. Wells. He is, indeed, the true invisible King of whom Mr. Wells has dreamed. He is clothed with might as with a garment. He is marching on in noble strife with all evil. He is marching on to an assured victory. But He is not "trampling victoriously over a broken cross." It is by virtue of the cross that He goes from strength to strength. The cross is the power of sacrifical love through which He works and wins. He is the Lamb in the midst of the Throne. There is but one throne in the universe, and He sits upon it. He is the ever-beating heart of those energies which sway the worlds, and direct them to their final goal. He is "the soul within the soul" of all those forces in human life which, despite the mad resistance of evil, makes for an

inevitable righteousness. He is never off the field; never discouraged; never resourceless. He is the power of God "which groweth not old."

This is the fact, the central fact, which shines forth in His cross. We see it in the light of His resurrection. And, for our stimulus and strengthening amid the ebb and flow of the battle, we ought to keep our vision of it constant and clear. Perhaps the war is helping us. Perhaps, as Rev. W. Temple says, it is reviving "faith in Christ as our heroic leader." Perhaps it has flashed upon our eyes an awful and yet inspiring recognition of the picture which the seer had in Patmos:—

> "His head and hair were white as wool, white as snow; His eyes flashed like fire, His feet glowed like burnished brass, His voice sounded like many waves, in His right hand He held seven stars, a sharp sword with a double edge issued from His mouth, and His face shone like the sun in full strength."

At any rate, the conception here figured is according to the truth. Jesus, the meek and lowly of heart, is meek and lowly still. He has not changed. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. But His loving will is a "will to conquer," and is charged with the dynamic of an "indissoluble life." In serving Him, therefore, we are on the winning side. There is no need to fear defeat for His cause, or for ourselves—if we are loyal.

The question is, are we loyal? If we are not, the King may have to do without us; and shame at last may be our crown. If we are, or are resolved to be, let us glory in our King.

F. J. Powicke.

A PROPHETIC LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Last month the Upper House, the Lower House, and the House of Laymen, of the Convocation of Canterbury passed unanimously resolutions welcoming the idea of a League of Nations. At the same time a manifesto, signed by the Primate and the Free Church leaders, appeared in the Press, urging that the formation of such a League of Nations to replace the Balance of Power policy "should be put in the very forefront of the peace terms as their pre-supposition and guarantee."

The idea of such a League of Nations is at least as old as Isaiah. The prophet who looked forward to a time when—

> "Men shall beat their swords into ploughshares,
> And their spears into pruning-hooks;
> Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
> Neither shall they learn war any more"—[1]

predicted also a League of Nations, when Assyria and Egypt the two great world-powers of his day, should form a triple alliance with the buffer state of Israel. Moreover, Isaiah had a very clear idea as to how this League of Nations was to be formed and maintained. Apparently neither military force nor economic pressure were to be its agents. It was to be cemented by the common worship of the prophet's God Jehovah the Righteous.

> "In that day . . . the Egyptians and the Assyrians shall serve Jehovah:
> In that day shall Israel be the third with Egpyt and with Assyria:
> Even a blessing in the midst of the land:
> Whom Jehovah of Hosts shall bless, saying,
> Blessed be Egypt My people,
> And Assyria the work of My hands,
> And Israel Mine inheritance" (xix. 23-5).

It is the fashion to-day to call Isaiah a statesman, possibly; judged by modern standards, he was something more. At any

[1] Isaiah ii. 4. This oracle is also to be found in Micah iv. 3, and may possibly be older even than Isaiah.

rate he saw clearly some 2,500 years before August Comte that spiritual must precede political re-construction. It is needless almost to write that Isaiah's League of Nations was never realised, and for the obvious reason that the Assyrians and Egyptians were never converted to the worship of Jehovah the Righteous, a Deity whom we imagine very few people besides Isaiah himself worshipped in that age.

To-day we believe, and we may hope, without undue optimism, that everyone desires a League of Nations. Count von Hertling has affirmed that he does. But the serious question is: How are we to form such a league, and how are we to maintain it? and the forming of the League, inasmuch as this comes first, seems even more formidable than its maintenance. Are we going to do it by drawing up and by signing manifestoes? There are a large number of persons who think we can. They have as much belief in the magical power of manifestoes as some superstitious persons used to have in silver bullets. The Bolsheviks attempted at first to counter the adverse German peace terms by "the distribution of millions of proclamations." It was a facile and seemingly inexpensive policy, although not in the end quite so inexpensive as it seemed.

There are not a few people in this country who are under a similar illusion. They believe in manifestoes; and, above all, they believe in the signatures at the foot of them; and he, who can draw the document in such vague and popular terms as to secure the greatest number of signatures for it, is a public benefactor; and he who signs it, thanks God as he wipes his pen that he has not lived in vain. The hero who slew the terrible ogre and delivered the princess, no longer undertakes it with a sharp sword and a large stock of cunning devices; instead, he approaches the ogre with a manifesto signed by the Pope, the Primate, the Premier, and the Labour Leaders, declaring how much happier the ogre and everyone else would be if he delivered up the princess. The ogre reads the

document, beginning with the signatures, and forthwith hands over the princess to the hero.

Nobody to-day needs converting to the League of Nations idea; what we need is to know how to form it. We would venture to urge that this can best be done by doing everything to cement and render permanent the present alliance between the British Empire, the United States, and France, three essentially pacific and democratic powers, and by a ready willingness to admit unto the League all other States as they undertake to adhere to these pacific and democratic ideals.

Already the League of Nations embraces in a loose sort of way, so far as population is concerned, some three-fourths of mankind. The problem is with the other fourth—the Quadriplice.

Mr. Lowes Dickinson on being asked recently whether the Germans should be admitted to the League of Nations, replied that they would be less dangerous within the League than outside it. We venture to think that if they leave their arms at the door, the League would be safer if they entered it, but if they brought their arms inside, the League would be safer with the Germans outside. If they brought their principles and methods in, these would be even more dangerous than if they brought their arms.

None of the manifestoes and resolutions we have yet read offer any satisfactory solution of the difficulty. We could, at any time, admit Germany and her allies into a League of Nations on similar terms to those on which Russia has pledged her friendship to the Quadriplice, but to do so offends the conscience and common sense of the League. Isaiah, the worshipper of Jehovah the Righteous, would not condemn such a feeling, for it was the converted Assyrians and Egyptians who were to be admitted to his Messianic League.

Sir George Paish, however, at a recent meeting of the League of Nations Society offered a solution of the difficulty

which although it would not have appealed to Isaiah, yet has attractions for a commercial community. Sir George said:—

> "The destruction of militarism, the establishment of the principles of national independence, and the creation of a league of democratic nations, in order that the world internationally may be governed with greater wisdom, cannot fail to accelerate the economic progress of the race."[2]

Sir W. H. Dickinson, in proposing a vote of thanks to the speaker, adopted the idea. He said that—

> "The League of Nations was not merely to be accepted for love of it, but because it was seen to pay. He was not convinced that Germany was yet ready to join for love, but she might join because it paid her to do so."[3]

This is another basis for the formation and cementing of the League. The Jewish prophet based his League of Nations on the worship of Jehovah the Righteous, but the more enlightened modern politician would base it on the worship of the Golden Calf. This seems to us to be the fallacy of Mr. Norman Angell stated in its crudest and most materialistic form, which Mr. Chesterton we believe summarised in the formula:—

> "All war must cease; for the Jews have decided that it does not pay."

On the other hand one of the great Dominion newspapers in a recent article on "The World's Supreme Need,"[4] deals with the question on sounder lines. The writer states the case thus:—

> "On the one hand there is the unquenchable desire for freedom, the passionate love of justice and fairplay; on the other the greed and tyranny of predatory powers, and the inordinate ambitions of tyrants and military castes. As long as those irreconcilable aims and aspirations exist the menace of war must remain. Considerations of self interest and the risk of disaster are not strong enough to overcome the temptation to national aggrandisement and world dominion. How can the nations hope for peace until the Prussian idea that war is part of the ground-plan of the universe, that 'strife is the father of all things,' is shattered.
>
> "Unless nations are regarded as 'moral persons,' and unless international relationships can be brought within the scope of the moral law, no league of nations, nor any system of international arbitration, can

[2][3] League of Nations' Society Report, No. 3, pp. 13-14.

[4] *Auckland Weekly News*, December 20th, 1917.

establish peace permanently on earth. All peace machinery must fail unless it has the support of some sanction, some moral influence strong enough to secure the faithful observance of treaties. International arbitration must be backed up by a highly moralised national and international public opinion, and this has yet to be created.

"A German authority lays it down that 'law and morality do not bind the will of the State. There is only one thing that hinders the State in its endeavours, and that is the fear of a foreign power.' This doctrine is utterly inconsistent with the formation of a family of nations—an ideal which can never be realised until states are prepared to treat each other as 'moral persons,' and to apply the principles of Christianity to problems of foreign policy.

"The general acceptance of these principles would bring the fulfilment of the Christmas hope within measurable distance. The present crisis is a challenge to the Christian Church. Never in all its history has the Church had such a magnificent chance of justifying its existence. With all its faults and shortcomings it is the greatest spiritual organisation in the world.

"If the Church could only rise to the height of its divine calling, it might become the abundant source of that strongly moralised international public opinion which is essential to the success of any scheme for the abolition of war. But the Church is divided, and how can a divided Church unify mankind? A united spiritual society, which could speak in all nations and to all nations with one authoritative voice, and unwaveringly uphold the supremacy of the moral law in every sphere of human activity, would exercise an almost irresistible power for good. The present feebleness of the Church is due to its disunion more than to any other cause. The call to unity has never been so imperative, and the need for it has never been so urgent. If the Christian Church would only show by its actions that it fully realised that 'we are living in a grand, an awful time'—a time of unparalleled opportunity and tremendous responsibility—it would surely find some way to peace within itself in order that it might become peacemaker among the nations. In no other way can it realise the ideal of its Founder, who declared in the most solemn manner that the establishment and maintenance of unity, peace, and concord among his followers would be the most effective way of making the world believe in His divine mission."

The duty of the Church is clear. Let her secure religious unity, and then mankind can be united. Here we are back again with Isaiah's League of Nations of 2,500 years ago. What immediate steps do our Church authorities propose to take in this country to that end? There seems to be room here for resolutions and manifestoes, and also for that closer fellowship to which Kikuyu testified the need and deep desire.

THE LIFE AND LIBERTY MOVEMENT.

At a public meeting of the Life and Liberty Movement, held in the Cambridge Guildhall on February 11, the President of the Churchmen's Union seconded the following resolution moved by the Rev. W. Temple:—

> "That whereas the present system of Church Government grievously hampers the spiritual efficiency of the Church, and threatens to hinder it from using to the full the great opportunity now before it, this meeting urges that steps be taken, without delay, to secure Liberty for the Church in the sense of full power to control its own life."

The resolution was carried unanimously. Professor Gardner claimed to second it as a Broad Churchman in general agreement with the aim of the Life and Liberty Movement. As a Liberal he desired four things for the English Church. (1) Federation with the Free Churches. (2) More power for the laity, especially in parochial matters. (3) More elasticity in the Sunday Services. (4) Freedom of thought. On the last he placed the most emphasis, and feared that, perhaps, sufficient importance was not attached to it by the promoters of the Movement. He said:—

> "There is need in every generation to restate the fundamental truths of Christianity in ways suitable to the changing intellectual atmosphere. Enormous progress is being made in Science and History. Christian teachers ought not merely to recognize and accept this, but eagerly to welcome it."

Professor Gardner frankly confessed that Broad Churchmen feared that a strongly organized minority might control the Church through the new constitution and alter its national character. He desired to see no party dominant. Each, said he, serves a useful purpose:—

> "The High Church stands for continuity and the value of the sacraments; the Low Church for personal religion and the facts of the spiritual life; the Broad Church for intellectual freedom, and the adaptation of essential Christianity to fresh conditions."

Some might say, "Give them all liberty and let them fight it out," but he thought that some further guarantees were needed to secure life and liberty for minorities under the proposed new constitution. He said:—

> "If four points were established in the new scheme, Liberals would be eager to help.
>
> (1) The baptismal franchise.
>
> (2) The legal status of Parish Councils, with considerable powers especially in the matter of the services. (This is the only way to interest the laity).
>
> (3) The effective control by Parliament of all serious changes. (Forty days on the table of the Houses of Parliament was insufficient in the case of new measures as is shewn by Oxford experiences. Changes in college statutes pass too easily).
>
> (4) The retention for the present of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to interpret the law. (In the past, each school in the Church had been thus protected, High, Low, and Broad, and few would think the decision wrong).
>
> "Some other important amendments in the scheme of the Archbishops' Committee are no doubt desirable. But these four things would protect liberty."

This forms a clear statement of the conditions upon which Liberals can support the Life and Liberty Movement. No Liberal worthy of the name will willingly sacrifice his principles to support a scheme which without careful safeguards can be rendered fatal to the National Church and that freedom and comprehensiveness which are for him the very breath of life.

First and foremost, Liberal Churchmen are concerned for *liberty in* the Church of England. They do not desire liberty to break rubrics, defy bishops, introduce Romanizing practices, but liberty to learn and teach the truth. They desire a free pulpit and a free Church press. That every clergyman, providing he be reverent and competent, and a sincere seeker of the truth whether in religion or history or natural science or metaphysic or the political and social sciences, shall be free to proclaim the truth especially in its bearing upon Christian faith

and practice. A clergy muzzled by fear of ecclesiastical censure, a pulpit tuned by political or episcopal authority, the Liberal soul abhors.

A second thing that Liberal Churchmen are concerned for is the *comprehensiveness* of the Church of England. That the Church of England shall be as wide as it is possible to make it. That all shall be members of it who will acknowledge the supreme moral and spiritual authority of Christ, and strive to live in loyalty to His principles. Hence a many-sided Christian ministry is needed; it must include men and women of different types and views. No colour must be given to the taunt that the Church of England is merely the Conservative party at prayer. Had our Church authorities been as anxious to maintain our Church's comprehensiveness as they have been to maintain her privileges, many who are outside to-day would have been inside her communion.

A third thing that Liberal Churchmen are concerned for is the *lay influence* in the Church of England. Lay knowledge in Biblical and ecclesiastical matters, with rare exceptions, must be less than clerical knowledge, nevertheless, the lay ideal of religion, with its strong emphasis on right feeling and right action rather than on correct thinking needs not only to be preserved, but to be developed in the interests of both Church and nation. It is the ideal of religion which Christ proclaimed in the Gospels. Its test is "By their fruits ye shall know them." Clericalism and priestcraft are grave dangers to the Christian religion. Of course, so also are ignorance and sloth, and there is no doubt that to-day we do suffer from an ignorant and apathetic laity. That, however, is mainly the fault of the clergy, and we may hope in time to remedy this defect. But an ignorant and careless laity is not so dangerous to the Church's well-being as an enslaved and hostile laity.

A fourth thing that Liberal Churchmen are concerned to maintain is the *national character* of the Church of England.

There are three types of Christian Church organization:—(1) The Denominational or Sectarian type; (2) the Imperial or Roman type; (3) the National or Local type.

The Denominational or Sectarian type has, we believe, no future. Its weakness is becoming more and more manifest. It has served in many ways a useful purpose in the past, but it is now losing its value and power of attraction. Already there is inscribed over its portal Ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ—"Nigh unto vanishing."

As for the Imperial type of Church organization, we believe that its realization belongs to the distant future, and is beyond the possibilities of the present. When there is a much higher and more uniform degree of spiritual, moral, and intellectual development among mankind than there is to-day, then only will it be possible to have one Universal Church, in which practically all mankind will be included. At present we are trying to substitute for the old mechanical imperial unity of the Roman Church a unity of spirit and ideal. But it will be many years before this unity of spirit and ideal can materialise in the form of one Universal Church throughout the world, directed by General Councils and a single hierarchy. At present we must be content to say: I believe in one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, and, while recognising that it does not exist, yet hope that the people of God may yet realise it.

To-day the practical question is whether the best way to advance that ideal is to strive now to unite the Church of England with the unreformed, unprogressive, and uneducated Roman and Orthodox Churches, or to strive by education and reform to realise our own ideal of the Church of England as enlightened, progressive, comprehensive, the national model in spirit and worship, in practice and knowledge, of the one Universal Church of the future—a Church of which the historic marks are continuity and evolution, and the spiritual signs, love, joy, peace, truth, holiness. It is this *Ecclesia Anglorum*

of the Venerable Bede, rather than the *Ecclesia Anglicana* of the Magna Carta, which Liberal Churchmen are concerned to preserve and promote to-day. For the Liberal Churchman the unit in the Universal Church of Christ is neither the Denomination of ecclesiastical sectarianism, nor the Province of ecclesiastical Imperialism, but the Christian Nation. The Liberal Churchman, like the Seer of the Apocalypse, in his vision of the Heavenly Jerusalem, sees the Nations (not the sects or the provinces) of them that are saved walking in the light of it.

If the Life and Liberty Movement, while seeking to achieve its aim of larger powers of self-government for the English Church is sincerely concerned to secure freedom of thought and utterance, comprehensiveness, the rights of the laity, and the national character of the English Church, Liberal Churchmen can give it their support. Liberals at least recognise the ineffective character of the Convocations and Houses of Laymen, and would gladly see some small and capable representative Church Council consisting of bishops, clergy and laity created to take their place, and given statutory powers to prepare Church legislative measures for the sanction of Parliament.

It is becoming steadily clearer that the present Church representative bodies are incapable of achieving Church Reform; it is just possible that a National Church Council might achieve it. On the other hand to give the Church perfect freedom to-morrow would not be to give her reform, but to plunge her into anarchy in which both freedom and unity would be lost. The Church of Ireland and the Anglican Churches abroad do not afford sound precedents in this matter. When disestablished they were more homogeneous than is the Church of England to-day. Yet even they can teach the Church of England that there are weaknesses and disadvantages connected with their method of government.

It is vain for the Life and Liberty Movement while striving to secure liberty *for* the Church to close its eyes to the serious danger which exists from the presence of a powerfully organized Catholic party which is resolved on Disestablishment for the express purpose of suppressing liberty of thought and teaching *in* the Church. This party knows that the present relation of Church and State is a fatal barrier to its policy of enslavement. It is therefore resolved to overthrow the national character of the Church. Its policy is Disestablishment; combined with bureaucratic centralisation especially in the matter of finance; followed by bloodless administration. This policy would drive out or suppress Liberal Churchmen and make federation or re-union with the Free Churches impossible. The Life and Liberty Movement seems blind to this policy, if indeed some of its adherents do not sympathise with it. Mr. Temple may feel that he is strong enough to control these elements. Frankly we doubt whether he is. We imagine that he parted most unwillingly with Miss Royden, but he was forced to do so by the Catholic section of the Life and Liberty Movement. It seemed to us also that the Baptismal Franchise was in some degree forced on the Life and Liberty Movement, and was not adopted *ex animo*. We know that it has only been accepted provisionally. It is true that the *Challenge* is not, as we supposed, the organ of the Life and Liberty Movement, yet it is very closely associated with it, and it has seemed to us to take at critical moments a line which makes Liberals feel the need for caution in uniting themselves to a movement that appears to their—it may be over-anxious—eyes to love ecclesiastical autonomy more than liberty.

ELOCUTION IN THE CHURCH.

It is almost a truism to say that the countenance of a man will give a fair representation of his feelings, interests, and emotions. You can generally tell when a man is interested by his face. Therefore, let any reader of this paper take a casual survey of an average congregation during the reading of the Lesson of the day, and, with the exception of those who are striving to follow the reader with their bibles, what will he see expressed in their faces? Impassive solemnity for the most part, sometimes inattention, boredom, and weariness. Seldom will he see a listener sitting up to catch the Word as it floats over his head, and intent to take in each beautiful passage. Seldom will he see what Stevenson calls a "morning face," eager to gather the good report of what he hears.

And why is this? Because the majority of clergymen have not the faintest idea how to read the Book of which they are the chosen interpreters. If Oliver Goldsmith's Chinaman should re-visit our shores, and learn that here was a body of men appointed to the care of our souls, whose main profession was that of reading and speaking to crowds, and that not one of them was compelled to master the art of speaking before he was allowed to minister to the public, his oriental eyes would start out of his head with astonishment. And yet such is the fact. Added to this, a custom has grown with the years of reading the Lessons in such an artificial sing-song as robs them of all sense and rhythm. The light of the Gospel shines upon us through a blinding mist of convention. The message of the Bible is couched in the noblest English, and is enshrined in passages of the loftiest poetry and profoundest philosophy, and yet it is read to us daily in the tone of an address of welcome to a distinguished citizen.

For example, take the dramatic condemnation of avarice and deception contained in the story of Gehazi on the occasion of the visit of Naaman the Syrian to the prophet. I have

heard the concluding words, "And he went out from his presence a leper as white as snow," delivered as though Gehazi had merely gone out for a walk. On the other hand, I have heard an old-fashioned clergyman render that passage with such expression that you felt a cold shiver down the spine. He simply felt what he was reading, and almost unconsciously made you feel it too, and you realized the full force of the words.

Take again that noble and stirring account of the sacrifice on Mount Carmel, which inspired Mendelssohn to perhaps his finest effort. How often do we hear it read with all the poetry and feeling left out? That "cloud no bigger than a man's hand" calls up no vision of the beauty of the created world and God's majestic power. The miraculous sacrifice, and gathering storm, which must have deeply impressed even the callous Ahab, is allowed to slip over the heads of the congregation as though it were either a sin or an indignity to have our hearts touched, and our imagination stirred by such passages, and indeed they are often read with the studied impassiveness with which a lawyer recites a dull conveyance. Surely the Bible is written and meant to stir our emotions, and to quicken our sense of right and wrong; otherwise we read it in vain, and there is no advantage in its being written in the mother tongue. It is no mystery, but God's message to man. Is it not, therefore, incumbent on the Church to make it as plain as possible to the humblest listener, and ought we not to go to our homes rejoicing in the heritage that our fathers have given to us with its cadences ringing in our ears rather, than in a state of uncertainty as to what it was exactly which has been read to us?

On one occasion I vainly strove to follow the lesson with the book in my hand, and, so indistinctly was it read, that for some twenty verses I was in doubt whether I had the right chapter until the words "And the Lode said unto Meuses" set my mind at rest. Others have had the same experience. Unless we were accustomed to read our Bibles not one of us would be familiar with it from hearing it read in Church.

The barrister who is indistinct in his utterance is soon reminded of it by the judge or jury; the politician, or public lecturer, is immediately asked to speak up if he becomes inaudible; but the clergyman is never reminded of his deficiencies, unless he is fortunate enough to have a candid friend in his congregation, and he himself is sufficiently humble and sensible to take a hint. I remember that the late Matthew Arnold, when he began his lectures in the United States, was unable at first to make himself heard beyond the first few benches, but after an elocutionary lesson or so, he was able to make his voice carry.

One fruitful source of inaudibility is the position of the lectern, which is commonly an eagle supporting a very large Bible, placed between the reader and the congregation, at such an angle that the sound of his voice is reflected into the roof of the Church, instead of being allowed to flow in a horizontal direction. The obvious remedy for this is to place the lectern somewhat askew, and for the reader to stand a little sideways in order that his voice may reach his audience without obstruction. A short-sighted man, moreover, is often at a disadvantage of lowering his head and burying it in the book at intervals during his delivery, but I have seen this obviated by the reader standing in the position I have indicated, and using a small Bible which he held in his hand.

I am not sure how the practice of intoning arose, but it is certain that the rubric does *not* prescribe, or even suggest, intoning the prayers, but rather orders them "to be read with a loud voice," or "rehearsed distinctly," and this is rarely done. That it can be done with reverence and expression, no one can doubt who has had the privilege of listening to the late Canon Ainger reciting the prayers in the Temple Church. Without any trace of self-consciousness he was able to bring home to his hearers the beauty of our Liturgy. The prayers and collects contain the most exquisite and expressive language, and yet, in most Churches they are delivered in a perfunctory way, and drawled out in a monotone, with many misplacements

of accent which destroy all the meaning of the words. Doubtless, the habit of intoning appears to some minds to be reverential, and to be desirable on account of its uniformity. A man cannot play individual tricks with the prayers. But is it really so reverential as it seems? Is it not possible to recite and to listen to intoned prayers with the mind far away from the service? Does not the very monotony tend towards inattention? Is it not right and seemly to give some expression to our feelings when we seek our Maker? If we approached an earthly king with a petition, we should not recite it in a monotone; we should wish him to understand what we say. Moreover, I would suggest that a good elocutionary training, given to every candidate for Holy Orders, would tend to eliminate most individual tricks of pronunciation, and inculcate the habit of reciting with the mind, and with a rational interpretation of words. Better a trick now and then, accompanied by expression, than the deadly monotony of intoning our prayers.

I must frankly admit that, in very large Churches and Cathedrals, where there is a full choral service, the practice of intoning seems more in keeping with the surroundings, and that it may be necessary to raise the voice above the normal pitch in order to fill large spaces, such as the Dome of St. Paul's, and the like, but I do urge that it is not necessary in a Church of moderate size. I should add that there is good reason for intoning prayers in which the congregation join vocally, such as the General Confession, and also the Responses, for, in the one case you avoid the curious growl caused by the mass of different tones, and in the other you gain continuity of harmony.

In the case of sermons it is hardly necessary to point out how essential is a sound training in elocution if you wish to turn out good preachers. Most public speakers gain some experience of oratory at meetings, councils, debating societies, and clubs where they discuss topics of interest, but under the

present Church system any man with a lisp, or other impediment in his speech, may be licensed and compelled to stand up and preach to his neighbours without any experience, and without the smallest knowledge of the art of voice production, pitch, or cadence—all so important to the public speaker. The matter of a sermon may be excellent, but, unless the delivery is good, you have a good preacher spoiled, a stunted growth.

This war has profoundly affected the nation, and has made us all perceive the necessity of setting our house in order in many ways. We are on the brink of great changes, many of them for the better. Committees have been appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to enquire as to the ways and means of reforming the Church, and they are told to pay special attention to the opinions expressed by Convocation. But from the subjects recently recommended (*Times*, July 4th, 1917) by Convocation for training theological students after the war, elocution is studiously omitted.

After all, the vitality of the Church greatly depends on the manner in which public worship is conducted, and I hazard the opinion that it is the monotony and boredom of the services, and the lack of oratory in the preachers, quite as much as the deficiency of matter in their sermons, to which the falling off in Church attendance, so much complained of, is due. Some men are born with a natural gift of speech, but it is no less true that with teaching and practice you may make a good speaker out of a bad one. It is of little use to train a man's mind to lead others unless you also teach him how to impart the products of that mind to his fellow men in the best way possible. The nation is not lacking in religious spirit, to which countless noble and Christian acts of our fighting men will testify, but our services will have to be brightened up, shortened, and made less dull if the Church is to keep its hold on the general public after the war is over. Is it too late to urge that some elocutionary test should be imposed on candidates for Holy Orders?

GILBERT COLERIDGE.

ARTHUR CHARLEWOOD TURNER.

By the death in France of Arthur Charlewood Turner, the Church of England, the Anglican Fellowship, and his friends, have lost one who deserves to be remembered with love and reverence.

Of the outward events of Turner's life little need be said. He was the third son of the Bishop of Islington, and was born in the year 1881. He was educated at Marlborough and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was first a Scholar and afterwards a Fellow, and, for some time, Junior Dean. He got his First in both parts of the Classical Tripos, devoting himself especially, in the second part, to the study of philosophy. He was a profound student of Plato, and it was from Plato, he once told me, that he learnt to care above all things for truth.

A stranger, having heard his friends speaking of him and then seeing him for the first time or hearing him speak, might have wondered at the remarkable influence he undoubtedly had over others. He was singularly quiet and reserved, spoke but rarely at the Conferences he attended, and when he spoke did so with obvious difficulty, and his utterances were frequently described as unintelligible. But one of his friends has, I think, gone as near to laying bare the secret of his influence as anyone could go in a sentence:—"He was about the most completely Christian sort of person I ever came across, with a charm which I think was just the radiance through his reserve of qualities most rare and fine." And another writes as truly of him:—"He has stirred love in many hearts and the quickening to things of beauty."

If I were asked to name, in one word, the secret of his charm and power, I think the word I should choose would be "sincerity." He was the most consistently sincere person

have ever known. Near the beginning of his essay in *Concerning Prayer*, where he invites his readers to embark upon a discussion concerning the relation between Natural Law and Spiritual Creation, he says:—"Let us pray that the one star may shine whose guidance is infallible—the truth which is also love." His whole life was a following of the guidance of that star. From him the search for truth was saved from degenerating into an arid intellectualism by love, and love was saved from degenerating into sentimentalism by truth. Truth was the manifestation and record of love, and love's activities, studied from without; love was truth realised from within.

I believe that the authorities of Trinity College, Cambridge, were disappointed that Turner, during the time of his Fellowship, produced no book, and that, had he done so, his Fellowship would have been renewed. That he produced no book was due, I believe, not to the fact that he was incompetent to write a far better book than most college dons could write, but to the fact that he was so fundamentally humble and set himself so high a standard that to produce anything for publication which was not the adequate expression of genuine personal conviction, founded upon the widest available knowledge, was abhorrent to him. He, at any rate, could not be content to produce "a book of patch-work learning second-hand." And so he left very little behind him in the way of published writings—nothing, in fact, beyond his one great essay on "Faith, Prayer, and the World's Order" in *Concerning Prayer;* one or two remarkable "Bulletins" circulated among members of the Anglican Fellowship, of which he was for a long time the Secretary; and a few papers, including a short series on the *Acts of the Apostles*, published in the *Challenge*.

The essay in *Concerning Prayer* is a careful statement of his fundamental faith. The book itself came into being in connection with, and as the result of, a series of conferences at

Cumnor. Before the first conference each writer produced a draft essay, copies of which were sent to the other members of the group. At the conference the essays were read, discussed, and criticised. Each author then amended and re-wrote his essay, and at the conference the process of mutual criticism was repeated. Turner's draft essay was the last to be produced, and was then nothing more than an inspiring fragment. And, at the end, his essay necessarily came almost last in the book because it was not finally finished until practically all the rest of the book was in page proof. It was the product, I know well, of something like an agony of thought and prayer. Its author expressly disclaims the aim of "providing anything like a complete philosophy of the subject,' but as a matter of fact within the eighty-five pages of the essay there is, largely expressed and everywhere implied, a profoundly satisfying philosophy of religion. It would be quite impossible to condense within the limits of this little article the already closely condensed argument of the essay. That argument is rooted and grounded in faith in God, the only ultimate reality, who for Turner, was not, as He is for so many, the empty sum of a series of separate attributes—Love, Wisdom, and Power, &c.—but the living, creative source, and ground of all that really is. For him God—Love—is the inner secret of all true life—love of which freedom is the correlative, so that God is as incapable of compulsion as He is of unwisdom. He believed that because God is love it is the special function of Christianity to realise itself in a spiritual community: and that this "has not happened because the Church has preferred order to freedom, and so tried to limit the action of the Spirit. Moreover the great adventure of Christianity—the seeking of the heavenly country—has been hampered because pious people have looked backwards rather than forwards, "sought security rather than adventure," and cared for the external rather than for the inward and spiritual, and so have often lost the true meaning of the very externals which they have fought

to preserve. So Turner's hope for the future lay in the attempt to bring men together in a spirit of fellowship, that they might get to understand one another, and discover one another's truth, in love, and come to be of one mind, so that the spiritual society might come to be the natural sacramental expression of a life wholly based upon a genuine and all-inclusive fellowship of men of good-will.

The essence of his conception of prayer is found in his words:—

> "The purpose of prayer is that man may know what God wills and, if dreams are shattered, may find among the ruins some greater good. The secret of prayers is less in the attainment of ends desired than in the discovery in the wreck of desires unfulfilled of some flaw in the design, some truer version that may rise above the world's obduracy or else some way of turning pain to action and remedial patience of outward evil. The Love of God is infinitely inventive."

The essay abounds in unforgettable ideas and phrases:—

> "The increasing number of pamphlets demanding our prayers upon an immense variety of details . . . gives the impression that it is supposed that the principal use of the prayers of the Saints is to lubricate the wheels of our intricate religious organizations."

Again:—

> "Science (to the 'pious') is the handmaid of Theology, or a furniture dealer from whose wares one may choose whatever happens to fit the preconceived style of decoration, and reject what is amiss. But science or rational knowledge is not the handmaid but the purgatory of religion."

And once more:—

> "He who pursues truth sincerely is always called to hazard all his fixed beliefs in the presence of a new fact. But it is the business of spirituality to bring new facts to light."

And this:—

> "With God everything is possible: but in God there are no unrealized possibilities."

And, lastly, this:—

> "If we are born children of many sins we are also born into a greater love."

"He had a constructive passion," writes a friend who shared many of his ideals, "for building up the Sacraments which are the Kingdom of God." He saw that the spiritual must express itself sacramentally, since the very existence of the

universe reveals that it is the nature of God so to express Himself.

He would have endorsed the words of one of his fellow contributors to *Concerning Prayer*, that

> "God is the reality of the world conceived as a whole, which, in its self-realisation and impulse towards unity, purges out of itself all evil and error."

So life's purpose for Turner was to labour for the increase of such a genuine fellowship among men, through the sharing of the divine spirit of love, that the existing social and ecclesiastical order might be purged of evil and error and renewed and recreated, as a sacrament of the Kingdom of God. In one of his last letters, he says:—

> "The immediately important thing isn't a programme of reconstruction, by which it is to be produced if we can make people accept it; but a way of going about things which will make way for it; because it will be an attempt to live after its rules and values."

And again:—

> "It seems that we can't work eventually for anything less than a revolution in men's minds and behaviour on a big scale; there is no limit we can set to it except a changed world."

Turner was profoundly convinced of the need for theological reconstruction, but he regarded it as only one means towards the larger end he had in view. And, indeed, in the letter just quoted, he says:—

> "I don't want to concentrate on theological reconstruction; but I want to get a better notion of truth spread about than the common idea of the theological deposit; and also an idea and practice of the search for truth as a social affair, necessarily involving fellowship and all the rest, and to get people to see it in its true relation to the other aspects of social life."

This letter was concerned with the remarkable Society, the Anglican Fellowship, of which he was the first Secretary, and in which his influence was a continual inspiration.

The Society is based entirely upon the new idea of a genuine fellowship, in which every member makes his individual contribution to a larger unity of thought and life; a whole more, in its unity, than the mere sum of the individual contributions.

Within the Fellowship there is no distinction of party, or utterance of party shibboleths. It contains men and women of all shades of thought, united, not upon the precarious foundation of a theological compromise, but upon the basis of a common adventure after reality, in a common dependence upon the Spirit of God; who is Truth and Love.

So he says, of the Anglican Fellowship in the letter, already quoted:—

> "The reason for our existence, its origin and its purpose, is not that we share at the outset a set of opinions about theology or economics, or what not, but a way of thinking about truth and its discovery. We are not immediately concerned with propounding a body of doctrines which are to be the *summa theologica* of all future Christianity; but we have got an idea about truth and how it may be discovered, and how the search for truth is mixed up with right conduct and behaviour towards one another. Similarly, we haven't economic or moral panaceas to advertise, but a method of co-operative moral and social discovery, based on a belief in the supreme value of people above everything else and a faith in human nature, that is the love of God. Our Fellowship is, or ought to be, at once a voyage of discovery and a warfare against evil. And we want to get everybody to help. But when invited to set out on a voyage or join in a campaign, people want to know what is the object of it all, and with what sort of company they are asked to join in. If we can't show them that, we shall seem to them to be asking them to join us in hunting the snark with thimbles and can, and all the rest of it. But I think we can, if we set our minds to it, show it to plain people, simple people like my soldiers—in such a way that they will see that, at any rate, it is something free from bunkum and a great adventure."

"Something free from bunkum"—that is characteristic of everything he thought and did and aimed at.

He dropped out of the National Mission Council—allowing himself to be called up as a private under the Derby scheme, though he could easily have obtained exemption if he would have continued to act as one of the Secretaries of the Mission—because the ecclesiastical bunkum was simply intolerable to him. . . .

The complete inability of the Central Council to face the true facts of the religious situation made it inevitable that Turner, as a member of it, should be like a fish out of water.

So he went away to train at Edinburgh, and later—by the exertion of his friends, for he would not exert himself in such a matter—he was given a commission. And at last, this time by his own exertion, he got out to the front, and after four months was killed by a stray shell in a place, known to the men out there as the "Happy Valley."

Re-reading what I have written, I see only too clearly that I have failed entirely—as it was inevitable that I should fail—to draw such a portrait of my friend as I should have wished to draw. His charm; his quaint and characteristic attitudes and gestures, and the no less characteristic jargon in which he was accustomed to write to his friends, are things impossible to convey to those who did not know him.

Exceedingly characteristic is the prospectus which he wrote of "A proposed Club for the promotion of true hilarity." A quotation from it will give a better idea of his true character—his humour and his originality—than anything I can say:—

> "The importance and the true nature of hilarity are too much neglected in the world, both by those who want to reform it, and by those who desire to make money out of it. Those who want to make money out of it are naturally self-interested also in their recreations; but before any suggestion of self-interest hilarity creeps away, and unnatural conventions amble in with eccentricities hurrying after. Those who want to reform it become one-eyed, and see only the mess which they want to sweep away, and cannot let go for a moment of their patent brooms; but before this one-eyedness again hilarity creeps away, and a forceful heartiness comes rolling in like a curate at a children's party.
>
> "Both these forms of pursuit—the desire to make money out of the world, and the desire to reform it—thrive in a world which is hemmed in by the fences of conventional thoughts and purposes; and the laboured excitements which are hatched by their followers are a part of the same world. People have divided it into two compartments, and called one work and the other recreation, so that they could fly to each in turn to escape from the other. And this disjointed whole goes round with the creaking and clanking of much machinery.
>
> "The fundamental difference between these things and true hilarity is that hilarity is free, and owes its existence to the unrestricted imagination of people bound together simply by a common and charitable

humanity. Hilarity thrives at the meeting of many. It vanishes before any suggestion of self-interest or conventionality or enforced merriment. All these things are unnatural, and hilarity asks only for naturalness.

"True hilarity creeps into the sources of our energies and causes them to effervesce with content. It airs and unclogs the brain and looses the great force of imagination, which alone enables a man to see what is true, and to do what is good.

"But the world is so full of stuffiness that in its business and solitude hilarity is often hard to come by. And the places where it should be found are too much invaded by those whom self-interest has paralysed aesthetically, and who fill the air with dreariness, and not seldom with ugliness.

"Somehow the world has got to be re-made. But it will all depend upon whether people will build it up with hilarity instead of trying to patch it together with some kind of mechanical patent glue. There are lots of excellent and busy organizations for remaking it, and there will be a hundred more. But the thought of them is full of hurry and tiredness. There are quantities of conferences and meetings. But conferences are specialized and mostly religious in an alarming degree. All these things in themselves are apt to be one-eyed and rather tight. Both those who take part in them and those who do not are in need of something less specialized, which will fill them with the refreshment and open-eyedness of hilarity as they go about their pursuits.

"It is proposed therefore to start a club for the purpose of promoting true hilarity for all such as are well-disposed. . . . It will be a place where people can behold one another and realize that they are all alive. Also they will eat together, and the satisfaction of eating is no small matter to the soul. This club will be a club, and not an association. It will organize nothing outside itself, and nothing inside itself that can interfere with the freedom of hilarity. Its atmosphere will be one of refreshment; that is to say it will be full of the things which give the world its real form and colour. Both play and work are arts and not industries, and the inspiration of hilarity is necessary to them both, to give them their true liveliness and proportion, and to prevent them from wandering off by themselves into separate ruts. In this club members will have opportunities for introducing all their lively and natural interests. Those who are artists will hang their pictures on the walls, and those who are craftsmen will exhibit their handicraft, and the other members will buy these things. Musicians will hold concerts, and the drama might give its contribution. Also there will be discussions on the things which make life worth living, and those who are doing things to let life and air into the common life will be invited to give an account of themselves.

"The club will not frighten people by wearing a religious or aesthetic or bohemian dress; it will not tire them by appearing a ceaseless engine of reformation. . . . All one-eyed kinds of specialists will be excluded,

> unless they can scrape off their one-eyedness on the doormat outside; such persons are intellectual acrobats, doctrinaires of all kinds, sectarians, party politicians, success-seekers, and commercial travellers in patent reforms."

Turner died, so the papers told us, on January 16th, but those of us who have been united to him by the closest bonds of love and friendship, and have been fired by the inspiration of his ideals and his teaching, can never for a moment think of him as dead.

His death in circumstances so utterly foreign to his whole temper and manner of life, in which he found himself simply through his desire freely to share, to the utmost of his power, the hardships which his brother men had to endure, came as the fitting climax to a life of which the secret was self-giving. A living philosopher has said that "oftenest perhaps, under the transfiguring touch of death, does the informing spirit of a beloved life—its 'idea' as Shakespeare calls it—stand revealed, lighting up the significance of individual acts or sayings, half-forgotten, as glimpses of a single soul." How often in these days we prove this true—and so it has been for this dear friend of ours. Death has revealed more clearly than we ever realized them before, the child-like purity and humility of his soul, the splendid sanity of his ideals, the Christ-like character of his unfathomable faith in God and his fellow-men. And we who have known him will feel that there is laid upon us by his death the privilege and responsibility of trying, in his spirit, to further those causes for which he lived.

C. H. S. Matthews.

DEATH—AS IT WAS AND IS.

Two recent books[1] bring vividly before us the changes which have passed over men's thoughts of death within the last three centuries. The first is a reprint of some short Early English Tracts on the Art of Dying, of which none can be assigned to a later date than the fifteenth century. These are preceded by a Preface, which is rather illustrative than critical, from the pen of the Rev. George Congreve, S.S.J.E., and by an Introductory Note of the Editor and Compiler, Frances M. M. Comper. The second is a small book by a living physician, Dr. R. W. Mackenna, in which he endeavours to describe the outward bearing and mental state—as far as this can be conjectured—of the dying. The two books can hardly fail to suggest a comparison between mediaeval and modern conceptions of death.

In the mediaeval tracts—for which the editor deserves our hearty thanks—the death-bed is conceived as the arena in which a man's good and his bad angel meet for their last and decisive conflict. His own disposition while the conflict proceeds is taken as an undeniable evidence of its issue. If he fails the failure is irreparable. If he stands fast he is assured of eternal life.

Hence the supreme importance of this final struggle:—

> "Let no man wonder, nor think that it is inconvenient that so great charge and diligence . . . and busy exhortation should be had and ministered to them that be in point of death . . . for they be in such peril and in so great need at that time, that, an it were possible, all a city should come together with all haste to a man that is nigh to the death or dying; as the manner is in some religious (*i.e.*, religious houses), in which it is ordained that when a sick man is nigh the death, then every of the brothers shall, when they hear the table smitten (a board was struck instead of a bell),—what hour that ever it be, and where that ever they be—all things being left, hastily come to him that is a-dying. Therefore it is read that religious people and women—for the honesty of estate—should not run but to a man that is a-dying and for fire" (p. 38).

Although Augustine is quoted to show that repentance, deferred to the hour of death, is seldom real (p. 34), it is none the less emphatically asserted that a genuine death-bed repentance will lead surely to everlasting salvation:—

> "Though any one man or woman had done as many thefts, or manslaughters, or as many other sins as the drops of water in the sea, and gravel stones in the strand, though he had never done penance for them afore, nor never had been shriven of them before—Neither then might have time, for sickness or lack of speech, or shortness of time, to

[1] *The Book of the Craft of Dying*, now first done into modern spelling, and edited by Frances M. M. Comper. Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Price 6/- net.
The Adventure of Death, by Robert W. Mackenna, M.D. John Murray, 1916. Price 3/6.

> be shriven of them—Yet should he never despair; for in such a case very contrition of heart within, with will to be shriven if time sufficed, is sufficient and accepted by God to save him everlastingly." (p. 13).

Let us look then at the preparation for this eventful moment which is here enjoined. A modern psychologist will perhaps not find it as easy to improve upon it as he might antecedently have supposed.

Stress is laid, in the first place and repeatedly, upon a willingness to die. The "good Christian man" does not resent death, or the illness which precedes it. He does not "grutch" or murmur at these painful experiences. He takes his death "gladly and wilfully," conforming and committing fully his will to God's will, and to God's disposition alone. He is helped towards this readiness by reflecting that

> "Death is nothing else but a going out of prison and an ending of exile; a discharging of an heavy burden, that is the body; finishing of all infirmities; a scaping of all perils; destroying of all evil things; breaking of all bonds; paying of the debt of natural duty."

The readiness to part with life thus extolled is not further examined or analysed. These tracts, we should imagine, were written for the most part by monks, and addressed to people living in the world. Analysis was, consequently, foreign to the purpose of the writers, even had it been congenial to them, as probably it was not. Hence they do not make distinctions, nor burrow very deeply into the recesses of men's minds. They assume that words, which we recognize as ambiguous, have only one meaning which they will convey to every one who uses them. Thus they do not stop to observe that a willingness to die may be susceptible of many different explanations. There are those in every age who, as the preacher of vanity tells us, long for death more than for hid treasures, and are glad, exceedingly, when they can find the grave. The Suicide is glad to die, and so was the great Apostle of the Gentiles. Ignatius the Martyr entreated his friends not to arrest the death which he so earnestly desired. Carlyle, with equal eagerness, longed for the end, and scientific curiosity has been known to remain dominant within the mind up to the very moment of death. The writers of these tracts have no mind for these distinctions, and are content to affirm broadly that to die well is to die gladly.

To illustrate the disposition which they thus wish to see they bring before us a number of temptations to which the soul is especially subjected by the approach of death.

The foremost of these is, as we might expect, the loss of faith. The word faith suggests to us at once intricate mental processes. We are conscious of the multiplicity of meanings which it conveys. To these writers, however, faith presented none of the difficulties which the Reformation controversies were so soon to raise. While the appropriation of Puritan faith demands a considerable intellectual effort, what is here required is no more than an adhesion by the will to the Church's Creed. This may be given without intellectual apprehension of what its articles involve. It is enough that there should be a sincere desire to remain in harmony with the Church:—

"Every good Christian man is bound namely habitually, though he may not actually and intellectually apprehend them, to believe, and full faith and credence give, not only to the principal articles of the faith, but also to all holy writ in all manner of things, and fully to obey the statutes of the Church of Rome, and stably to abide and die in them. . . But wit thou well that in this temptation, the devil may not noy thee, nor prevail against no man unless he will wilfully consent unto his temptation" (p. 10).

The picture of Christ too here presented is simpler, and as we should say more engaging than that of Puritan theology. The soul is invited, not to appreciate the work of Christ, nor to unfold its implications, but simply to contemplate the dying Redeemer:—

"Every doing of Christ is our instruction and teaching; therefore such things as Christ did dying on the Cross, the same should every man do at his last end, after his cunning and power. And Christ did five things on the Cross. He prayed, for He said these psalms: *Deus, Deus Meus, Respice in Me;* and all the psalms following unto that verse: *In manus tuas, Domine.* Also He cried on the Cross, as the apostle witnesseth. Also He wept on the Cross. Also He committed His soul to the Father on the Cross. Also wilfully He gave up the ghost on the Cross" (p. 27).

The simplicity and concreteness of this appeal stand out in sharp contrast against the severe intellectual demands of the substitutionary theology.

Of the other temptations enumerated it must be enough to observe the intention of the writers to save those whom they address from the impatience and despair which may easily be induced by severe suffering, while at the same time they warn them against the dangers of spiritual pride:—

"No man should despair, though it were so that it were possible that he alone had done all manner of sin that might be done in the world" (p. 14).

On the other hand no man certainly knows "Whether he be worthy of everlasting love or hate" (p. 19).

The object of the other book is to reconcile us to the thought of death by allaying the dread of severe suffering with which its approach is generally contemplated. In Dr. Mackenna's opinion, death itself is usually painless. The distress which the spectacle awakens in the onlookers is not felt by the patient himself. In expressing this opinion, however, he is careful to separate the actual experience of death from the illness by which it is preceded, and which may be long and painful. He tells us, too, that the fear with which death is often regarded by those in health generally subsides, and in the end ceases as the actual change becomes imminent, so that he has never "seen any one about to die evince the slightest fear of the impending change," and he assures us that this experience of his "is supported by a great body of weighty medical opinion."

To support his view that death is generally painless, he produces many competent witnesses. Here, *e.g.*, is the testimony of Sir William Osler:—

"I have careful notes of about 500 death-beds, studied particularly with reference to the modes of death and the sensations of the dying.

Ninety suffered bodily pain or distress of one sort or another; eleven showed mental apprehension; two positive terror; one expressed spiritual exaltation; one bitter remorse. The great majority gave no sign one way or the other; like their birth, their death was a sleep and a forgetting."

Thus, while the mediaeval writers labour to keep our attention fixed upon death, Dr. Mackenna strives to release us from some of the fears its approach awakens, and so to make it of less account in our minds. This seems the most marked distinction between mediaeval and modern conceptions. We quote, with approval, the great saying of Spinoza: *Homo liber de nihilo minus quam de morte cogitat.* A free man thinks of nothing less than of death. We endeavour to look beyond death and not at it. It will always remain, however, an engrossing subject of thought, forcing itself upon us whether we invite or repel it. Indeed, it may be questioned whether it is not the strongest moral lever we have. Thus the question as to the best preparation for it can never lose its relevance. And here it occurs to us to observe that death does not stand within our experience separate and unique, as might at first sight appear. We have premonitions and anticipations of it. To St. Paul the experience of death was of daily occurence. A Puritan writer of the 16th century, William Perkins, speaks of the "little deaths" by which the great occurrence is preceded, like the messengers whom a king sends before to announce his approach. By these "little deaths" he means those sacrifices which we are called upon from time to time to make, and by which we reach a greater fulness of life. The soul gains while it seems to lose. It makes its dead self the stepping stone to higher things. This was what the Apostle meant by dying to live, and this seems to constitute a better, because a more habitual, preparation for death than any confined to the death-bed or the sick room. The soul which has accustomed itself to the little deaths, will not resent, or may even welcome, the great one when it comes. It finds no difficulty in the monastic maxim: *Bene mori est libenter mori.* Losing its life it finds it. Dying, behold it lives.

J. Gamble.

THE FAITH OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.[1]

"Your educated laity is a myth," was the crushing remark of an Anglo-Catholic friend to the reviewer. And indeed, the Church has become so largely an *asylum ignorantiae*, that it has been difficult to counter the taunt. But the publication of Canon Glazebrook's book may supply a refutation, for it will be bought by the educated laity. If they exist, statistics from the publisher will prove it.

Canon Glazebrook has succeeded admirably in giving, within a small space, a quite adequate and convincing exposition of Liberal Churchmanship. And his language is not only popular, but it is (what rarely happens in works

[1] *The Faith of a Modern Churchman*, by M. J. Glazebrook, D.D. (Modern Churchman's Library). Murray. Cloth, 2/6; paper, 1/6.

of this character) explicit: we know where we stand: we are not put off with the *patois* of conventional religiosity. And his treatment of the problem of Christianity is not speculative (to the speculator all things are lawful), but historical and psychological. He eschews the *a priori*, that *deus ex machina* of the positive or negative dogmatist, the guiding principle of Dr. Ingram or Mr. McCabe. His method, no doubt, does leave us with "a residuum of mystery," but as we know, "They see not clearliest who see all things clear," and it is the only method that will carry us anywhere, for we are not concerned with what God might have done, but with what He did and does, not with human speculations, but with the events of history, and the sequences of psychology. Take the question of miracles:—

> "The *a priori* objection to miracles may, from the point of view of modern Churchmen, be disregarded."

Supposing (which is perhaps doubtful) that the clericalist press devotes space to reviewing this manual, they should print this sentence in largish type. In itself it is a refutation of libels which are perhaps too handy to be dropped. But to proceed. *A priori* arguments *in favour of* miracles are also inadequate.

> "We often hear men argue that the wonders of His [Christ's] nature make it natural for us to expect material miracles from Him. That may be true. But we may not use *a priori* arguments—that is, arguments based upon the tendencies of our own minds—as a substitute for positive evidence. . . . Facts are none the less facts because our minds are unable to conceive them: nor does our power to conceive an event prove that it is likely to happen."

The question is one of evidence, and the insufficiency of the evidence leaves the problem open. With reference to "the two cardinal miracles" about which our "inquisitorient bishops" have been exercised, we read:—

> "Modern Churchmen do not deny that these wonders happened. But they do claim that, in view of the nature of the evidence, men should not be regarded as heretics who decline to affirm them."

It is curious, but true, that it takes the master-hand to write a simple book. Experts will be able to see what a wealth of exegetical and historical knowledge lies behind these readable and often fascinating chapters. To anyone coming upon the facts or arguments that these pages contain, for the first time, they will constitute a revelation. If Blake's aphorism is true, that "Truth can never be told so as to be understood and not to be believed," this manual will (provided that it circulates) prove very effective. Sometimes, however, the evidence inclines us to agree rather with Pascal, when he says that: "Man does not wish to be told the truth, and avoids telling it to others."

However, it is the business of the Liberal to sow seed: "it springeth up, he knoweth not how." And the harvest, if it ripen, will be a rich one; for, as Jowett told the more sympathetic audience of his day—

> "No man can form any notion, from what we see around us, of the force which Christianity might have if it were at one with the conscience of man, and not at variance with his intellectual convictions."

And the reviewer cannot close these remarks without saying how wise he believes the policy of Canon Glazebrook to be with regard to the Creeds. Re-interpretation *at present*, and not revision, would be his formula. The hot-heads amongst us sometimes forget that if you are to have fetters, it is better to have them loose, old, and a little rusty, than bright, well-fitted, and efficient. A new formula would be a new prison with fewer windows to let in the air. Truth, said Renan, is a *nuance;* and let us be content to have it so. An old definition of the indefinable is often better than a new one.

J. C. HARDWICK.

THE SOUL OF A LAYMAN.[1]

A layman when he writes on religion is always interesting to a clergyman. It is not that he is more acute or better informed in strictly theological matters, he is often less so, but he is so fresh and unconventional. Freshness and unconventionality rouse interest, and they certainly produce the impression of sincerity on the mind of the reader.

William Dannatt, of Great Waltham, who died on November 6, 1914, left behind him a diary of 270,000 words recording his religious views and experiences. Extracts from this diary have been selected and arranged for publication by Mr. J. E. G. de Montmorency with skill and sympathy.

Mr. Dannatt was not a wide reader; he has no charm of style; his book is worlds' apart from Amiel's *Journal Intime*; nevertheless, it is full of interest. It is marked by sober piety, shrewd common sense, and sterling morality.

Mr. Dannatt was a farmer; a sort of super-farmer, for he made farming pay during the most disastrous period of English farming. How he did it is told in his *Practical Hints from the Note-book of an Old Farmer.* Another of his books which throws light on his success is his *Farm Account Book.* The estimation in which he was held as a farmer is perhaps measured by the fact that he was called as a witness before the Committee on National Wheat Stores in 1897. His evidence would prove interesting reading to-day.

But, although a most successful farmer, and possessed of extraordinary practical ability, he was also deeply religious. Of the successful farmer he wrote:—

> "He must be an early riser . . . He must be a good judge of stock, a good manager of men, gifted with foresight of an uncommon degree, and, in order to understand the complicated implements now used, a good mechanic. He must also have a smattering of chemistry . . . must be a good salesman, a man of patience, industry, and good judgment; and, above all, he must have his whole heart in his business."

Yet he believed, with the Wise Man, that it is the blessing of the Lord that maketh rich. His favourite motto was:—

> "Do your best and leave the rest;
> But in the middle ask God to bless."

[1] *The Faith of a Farmer.* Extracts from the Diary of William Dannatt. Edited by J. E. G. de Montmorency. Murray, 1917. 5/- net.

Thus, as Mr. de Montmorency says, his whole work as a practical farmer was inspired by a sense of trusteeship placed in his hands by God Himself. But if he went his way to his farm, as did the man in the parable, yet he also heard the call of the Kingdom of God, and strove to obey it in all the relations of daily life. His diary provides a view of that inner side. The most remarkable incident in it refers to the August before his death. Having been long ill and suffered greatly, he writes:—

> "I had sunk to such a peaceful state, free from pain, but conscious of a most wonderful sense of peace beyond any description, a sense of feeling which can only be described as passing man's understanding . . . My breath seemed gradually to leave me at first, but not for death. I knew I was not going to die just then, and that I was experiencing God's peace. And this I am sure was in answer to my long-expressed prayers for Jesu's help. . . . I wish to note the indescribable sense of reality it brought. I felt that if a whole life-time were spent in asking for that peace . . . the reward was too great. Nothing earthly could be compared to or worthy of comparison with it. Blessed be God!"

For many, an experience of this kind is of much greater interest than Mr. Dannatt's religious views and practices. Yet these views and practices are of great value because they reveal the soul of the average religious English layman.

Mr. Dannatt believed in the observance of Sunday. He was a great worker, and he enjoyed its rest. He acknowledged that one may work on it, but he would not. It is a day to delight in; a day to worship God; a day to reflect on things eternal; a day to do kindnesses; to pay a little more attention to one's wife and children; a day which should be a blessing to one's animals and servants. When unable to go to Church, he read through the service at home for others as well as for himself.

Again, he believed strongly in the religious education of children, and deplored the sectarian strife which was, with the exception of sloth and indifference, its greatest enemy.

Holy Communion, he though of as altogether good, and above all, a service of joy and gratitude. But he held that there is "*no mystery about it.*"

He took a great delight in the beauty of Nature, but Church Art in the form of pictures, sculptures, stained glass windows and crucifixes gave him no real pleasure or sacred joy. He delighted in hymns, like most laymen, and wished that there were more of them in the Services. He regarded the love of money as one of the most powerful of temptations, and prayed:—

> "O keep me from the love of money; let not the love of money overcome me; if I am not able to overcome it, then withhold it from me."

Like most Englishmen he enjoyed manly sports, especially cricket, hunting, and shooting. He preferred steeple-chasing to flat racing. But his work compelled him to give up his sports one by one. In sports he desired that certain humane practices should prevail. He advocated shorter courses for hard steeple-chases. He was against the digging out of foxes, and the stopping of their earths.

There is much more to be said of the experiences, views, and practices of Mr. Dannatt, but space forbids. Suffice it to say that he was typically English. He read his newspapers *cum grano salis*; he feared political rancour; he believed in the freedom and justice of the British Empire. As for clergymen, he held they must be "taught of God" if they are going to teach others rightly; he was also of opinion that their real influence will depend on their goodness.

Country clergymen would do well to study this book. The reviewer preached two sermons on it to an interested country congregation, and possibly half-a-dozen could easily be obtained from it. Modern criticism, Mr. Dannatt seems to have known nothing of, yet his spiritual life is drawn from that part of the teaching of the Bible, which criticism can neither weaken nor undermine. He fed, as Fuller would say, on the good meat of the Word, and so was not choked by its dry bones. His Churchmanship was of a type which is untouched by either the Evangelical or Anglo-Catholic Movements, a type of English Christianity which we believe to be very common among English laymen to-day, whether soldiers or sailors or merchants—a Christianity which does not believe in shibboleths or ritualism. Such a religion may seem to the clerical mind to be commonplace and uninteresting, but in the eyes of the Son of Man we believe it to be most precious.

H.D.A.M.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

Oxford Branch.—A meeting was held in Lincoln Common Room on Friday, February 22nd, Professor Gardner in the chair. The Secretary remarked that the Memorandum on the Church and State Report, lately issued by the Council of the Union, was in part, at least, the outcome of a Resolution passed by the Oxford Branch, and that most of the suggestions they had made had been embodied in one form or another. The fact is worth noting as an illustration of the kind of work which may be done by local branches. Mr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, of Balliol, read a most suggestive paper on "Truth in the Church and in the Churches." He insisted on the reality of the continued working of the Spirit, but suggested that the evidence of that working was to be seen, not so much in fixed formularies or in external organization, as in the general mind of the Church, interpreted as widely as possible. He urged that creeds should express the religious experience by which Christians really lived rather than formal doctrine, and that they should not be used as tests to exclude. A good discussion followed, in which the Chairman, Miss Dougall, Miss Campbell, Miss West, Dr. Skrine, and Mr. Emmet took part, cordial agreement being expressed with the main theses of the paper.

London Branch.—A meeting was held on February 12th at 4, Sussex Gardens, by kind invitation of Col. and Mrs. Gerard Clark. The subject being "The Life and Liberty Movement," The Rev. F. H. Gillingham, of Bermondsey, kindly came to speak as a representative of that Society. The Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig opened the discussion, in which several members took part.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A CANADIAN VIEW OF THE LIFE AND LIBERTY MOVEMENT.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The experiences of those branches of the Anglican Communion which are self-governing, such as the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States and the Canadian Church are, at the present time, worthy of more careful study by English Churchmen than they are receiving.

Rev. Thomas J. Hardy, in a letter published in the *Church Times* for January 11, after pointing out the indubitable, but, to him, painful fact, that the differences within the Church of England are "not merely of opinion and statement, but of mentality, of type," proceeds to write as though, given Disestablishment, this profound cleavage between schools of thought would disappear. Exactly how or why, he does not say, further than that each would "have liberty to go their several ways." But such liberty is theirs now. The Anglo-Catholic is not bound to remain in a Communion which allows many of his most cherished beliefs to be, openly and without reproof, denied. The Liberal Churchman is not bound to remain in a Communion which contains powerful reactionary and even obscurantist elements. Each has already liberty to go his several ways, but each prefers to remain where he is, and would probably so prefer after Disestablishment. Perhaps Mr. Hardy really means that, given Disestablishment, the stronger party would eject the weaker, and we have had more indications than one that this is what the dominant party in the Church desires.

I should like to point out that this cleavage of thought, amounting to a difference in mentality or type exists in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and is not likely to disappear either voluntarily or by compulsion. Thus, only a few weeks' ago, in a large city in the State of New York a united service was held in a Protestant Episcopal Church at which members of various communions were present, all of whom were admitted to the Holy Communion which formed part of the service. The service was reported in the New York *Churchman*, but the report created, so far as I have observed, not even a ripple of surprise or of resentment. On the other hand, about the same time, reports appeared of the most elaborate High Mass in a P.E. Church in Chicago.

May I add that, as an Englishman by birth, but with many years' experience on this side of the Atlantic, I am deeply interested in the *Life and Liberty* movement, but after a good deal of hesitation I have come to believe that there is more promise for the Church of England in the strengthening of the Establishment, by the revision of the Act of Uniformity. The proposition to hold another Savoy Conference may be somewhat premature, but it is along the right lines.

H. SYMONDS.

Christ Church Cathedral,
Montreal, Feb. 11th, 1918.

IMMORTALITY.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

In these times it is only the few that can purchase new books, and have leisure to read them. So most of us have to be content with perusing the reviews.

I have read with interest the review in the *Modern Churchman* of the new book on Immortality, edited by Canon Streeter, and the impression left at the close is that it does not give us much more than students on the subject already know.

One method of approach appears to have escaped attention, and that is by endeavouring to enter into the mind of Christ. What is the paramount impression left after reading the gospel story of the life of Jesus? Surely it is that here was one who always lived consciously in the presence of God, and to such an one doubt about the future was impossible. Nor did He claim that this gift was peculiar to himself, for "if ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him."

It is to be feared that the creeds, while professing to give equality to the Holy Spirit have really relegated the doctrine to the back ground, and yet it is the very aspect (or *persona*) of God whereby the human soul comes into closest touch with Him. What is the result of the gift which is within reach of all who truly pray? Is it not a re-birth, the possession of a spiritual joy and enlightenment? The soul knows that it has been penetrated by a power greater than itself; its vision has become purified and enlarged; it sees God in the universe, sometimes it melts with joy under the sense of beauty; at other times it is inspired with awe and admiration under the consciousness of power and order; while on the human side it sees glimpses of the divine greeting it through the eyes of many a brother man or woman. And so through this experience the soul learns to transcend the bounds of individuality, the indwelling of the divine has made it suprapersonal, it has entered a larger life which the dissolution of the body cannot destroy. This, I think, is the truest and most direct way of approaching the problem, and we arrive at the conviction that the God in us cannot die.

As to a logical proof, that seems in the nature of the case impossible. Jesus, I think, implied this when He said on another occasion: "If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead."

It is only fair to admit that a similar experience may come to some who do not profess Christian discipleship. There is what is called the cosmic consciousness. A sense of oneness with Nature which enlarges and purifies the soul, but it may lack that self surrender and devotion associated with the Christian attitude.

EDWARD CAPLETON.

28, *Red Lion Square, W.C.*,
February 25th, 1918.

***The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.